

CHRONICLE

OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

Of the works that have been published since the last Old Testament Chronicle appeared in these pages, to most readers the most interesting and informing will doubtless be *Archaeology and the Bible*, by Prof. G. A. Barton (American Sunday School Union, Philadelphia, 1916). The author is well known for his studies in Semitic religion, &c.; and as former director of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem gained a first-hand acquaintance with the field. The book is divided into two parts (of about 460 pp.): Part I, 'The Bible-lands, their exploration, and the resultant light on the Bible and History'; Part II, 'Translations of Ancient Documents which confirm or illuminate the Bible.' Besides this, there is a section with 114 plates containing 9 maps and over 300 figures. The book is a really admirable achievement—it is priced two dollars—and is a good representative in English of Gressmann's *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder* (*J. T. S.* xi p. 117). Prof. Barton's book may be cordially recommended, for, although one may point to omissions and hazardous views, it is a distinct advantage to have in one volume the material which is here collected and presented in so handy and pleasant a form. The book as a whole is more 'Biblical' than 'archaeological'. Part I deals with the surrounding civilizations; with Palestine, its exploration and the archaeological discoveries; with the pottery and other objects; with the weights and measures, high places, temples and tombs, and finally with Jerusalem, the Decapolis, Asia Minor, and Greece. In consequence of its scope the book both gives that which an ordinary Bible handbook would omit or condense, and it ignores much that is purely biblical and upon which archaeology throws no direct light. It is pleasing to observe, in Part I, Prof. Barton's warm appreciation of the excavations by the English Pioneer Society, the Palestine Exploration Fund, and especially his cordial and complete acknowledgement of the value of the work by Prof. R. A. S. Macalister, whose account of the 'Excavation of Gezer' is styled 'a model of what such a publication should be'.

Part II contains a very good selection of illustrative texts, Babylonian and Egyptian—including not only historical material, but also such important pieces as the Code of Hammurapi (nowadays spelt with -p) and some of the fine monotheistic Egyptian poems of the fourteenth century B. C. The book is well adapted for Sunday-school teachers and students, and its utility is much increased by good indexes.

More archaeological and less biblical is the handbook by Mr P. S. P. Handcock, M.A., *The Archaeology of the Holy Land* (Macmillan Co., London, 1916). Since Palestinian archaeology was first established on modern scientific principles by Prof. Hugues Vincent in his 'Canaan d'après l'Exploration Récente' (1907), the need for less technical accounts with reference to excavations since that date has often been felt. For the difficult archaeological, historical, and other related problems, one must necessarily refer to Vincent, Thiersch and other specialists; but Mr Handcock's book will suffice the ordinary reader, who will find it a helpful guide to the more advanced questions of interpretation, chronology, foreign influences, and so forth. Mr Handcock, formerly assistant in the department of Egyptian and Assyrian antiquities at the British Museum, and also a lecturer of the Palestine Exploration Fund, has a good knowledge of the subject, and he succeeds in giving a useful account of the arts, crafts, manners, and customs of the inhabitants of Palestine. He makes his latest limit the Roman period, and endeavours to make the ancient people live again in the objects of their religious or secular life. After a brief discussion of the chronological periods—the most important of the archaeological problems—he passes to the caves, rock-cuttings, and buildings; objects of all kinds are classified and discussed according to their material (flint, bone, stone, metals, pottery, terra-cotta). Two interesting chapters deal with burial customs and religious antiquities. There are nearly 140 plates, plans, and figures, and altogether Mr Handcock's book is a useful introduction. There are, to be sure, many cases where different or better views are possible, and here and there his remarks are not a little obscure—e. g. his treatment of the 'clean' and 'unclean' animals (p. 361 sq.). A more unfortunate impression is likely to be caused by the opening sentences, with their misleading antithesis between written sources and the 'incontrovertible and concrete facts' of art, culture, &c. Not only is the tone quite uncalled for in a serious work, but once one passes beyond the rudiments of archaeology, nothing is more certain than that the concrete 'facts' depend upon an interpretation, and that, touching the interpretation and inferences, there are some very serious conflicts of opinion. As examples of this, reference may be made to the problem of the chronological periods of ancient Palestinian culture (pp. 22 sqq.), and to the question whether certain monuments had a secular or a specifically religious purpose (cf. pp. 20 sq., 338). Besides, as a matter of principle, it is out of place for an archaeological writer to say that 'ordinary history is dependent on written statements, which are in nearly all cases either biased by the self-adulation of the writer, or else prejudiced by the antagonistic attitude of the recorder...' Archaeologists are not faultless in this

respect. It should, however, be said that serious lapses of this sort are very few (cf. p. 101 sq. on the fall of Jericho), and that they do not at all affect Mr Handcock's book as a whole.

The Rev. J. Politeyan, B.A., publishes his lectures given at the Summer School at Swanwick, in connexion with the London Jews' Society, and elsewhere. He calls the book *Biblical Discoveries in Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia* (Stock, London, 1915), and Canon Girdlestone contributes a foreword in which he points out the advantages, as an interpreter of oriental points of view, possessed by the author (a Greek by descent, with Armenian blood, and born in Cilicia). The author, for his part, emphasizes the real difference between eastern and western modes of thought and expression, and the inability of the one justly to appreciate the other. His platform is twofold: (1) That the Bible is a book of divine revelation and therefore not one to which one can apply the ordinary tests which can be applied to other works of literature; and (2) that, the Bible being pre-eminently a book of the ancient East, we must acquaint ourselves with its *true historical setting* (pp. 4 sqq.). It is clearly no easy task to run these two steeds together in harness. However, he surveys the biblical history from Gen. i to the Persian empire, bringing out briefly the data from the monuments or excavations which confirm or illustrate the biblical sources; maps and illustrations add to the utility of the book, and the reader can thus learn of the manifold ways in which the external evidence bears upon the Bible. That the author should find therein a support for conservative views is not surprising; but it is to be regretted that, instead of pursuing the questions that arise, he appears to assume that the work of modern biblical criticism is nullified. As he has published this book 'in compliance with a general wish', it is to be feared that his hearers gave too ready a credence to his remarks upon the failures of criticism and did not notice the weakness of his arguments. As a whole, the book, in spite of many useful features, is spoilt by signs of haste and impatience. He has appended a list of books in order to stimulate his readers to biblical archaeology, and he naïvely observes, 'I take no responsibility for the views expressed therein'; but what will the reader make of 'Macalister, "Palestine Exploration Fund Statement"'; 'Palmer, "The Desert"'; 'Driver, "Modern Researches as Illustrated in the Bible"' (a piece of unconscious humour), 'Sayce, "Fresh Lights from Ancient Monuments"'. Other inaccuracies and signs of haste appear both here and in the body of the book. The Code of Hammurapi was discovered in 1901 not 1891 (p. 13); on p. 50 for Borghas Keui read Boghaz Keui; on pp. 57, 60, De Saulcey is wrongly spelt. Besides Mizraïne (for *-im*, p. 122), Shurich Lecture (for Schweich

Lect. p. 124 n.) and Habrai (for Habiri or the like, p. 117), the reader should correct *tebba* and *teb* ('ark', pp. 34, 88, for *tebhah*), and *gama* ('papyrus', p. 88, for *gōmē*). Although the citations are not necessary for the argument, they might as well be more or less accurate; and although the inability even to transliterate Hebrew need not endanger a good argument, sometimes an ignorance of the language has distressing results. Mr Politeyan's innocence is evident when he says that 'the chief object of worship was Ashtaroth' (p. 126),—see *any* book on Judges ii 13 or on the plural form Ashtaroth. (I do not understand 'Ashta' on the same page—? emend to Ishtar or Astarte.) But the strangest case is on p. 108, where we read that the spies were ordered to 'start *southwards* although Palestine lay to the north of them'. Upon this Mr Politeyan bases an elaborate argument, whereas, had he taken the trouble to consult the R.V. of Num. xiii 17 (not to speak of any modern commentary), he might have avoided his mistake. It is much to be deplored that a book which treats of an important subject should be so marred as this is by faulty reasoning and by irrational and ignorant attack upon a criticism which it has not attempted to understand in any intelligent manner.

Mr Eric S. Robertson, M.A., has written a book of a rather novel type: *The Bible's Prose Epic of Eve and her Sons: the 'J' Stories in Genesis* (Williams & Norgate, London, 1916). It consists of a series of sketches dealing with the subjective and psychological aspects of some of the delightful stories in Genesis which are ascribed to the 'J' narrator or source. Popular affection has always clung to them; and the old Genesis and not the reshaping in the Book of Jubilees retained the love of the Jews. It is well, then, to endeavour to determine the subjective value of the narratives, to enter, if possible, into the mind of the writer or writers, and to attempt to see if some of their charm and value can be re-expressed and appreciated by ourselves. Among recent scholars some considerable attention has been paid to the literary aesthetical aspects of the Old Testament by Gunkel, Gressmann, and by Luther (in Ed. Meyer's *Die Israeliten*); and it would have been interesting if Mr Robertson could have taken some account of them, in order to test the views which these have already published. Critical work, to be of any objective value, must pay more attention to what has been done by others. None the less, for English readers such a book as this will be useful as an example of the type of psychological studies through which the Bible gains in living interest; and the more thorough the psychological analysis and the more the results are checked by reference to other departments, so much the more does the Old Testament recover its older personal significance for the ordinary reader.

After referring to 'J's share of the Bible', Mr Robertson gives eleven sketches, beginning with 'the Birth of Woman' and ending with 'Camels from Mesopotamia'. He points out how the teaching is implicit, not explicit (cf. pp. 20, 140). 'The subtle J teaches, not by laying down religious laws, but by depicting the life of religion, as it opens and expands upon human consciousness.' We descry 'an ethic that is only dawning' (p. 164). Great fundamental ideas are embodied in episodes and historical cataclysms. So, the author discourses on the Birth of Woman, of War, of Wine, of Cities, of Religion, and of a Nation; on Darkness in Egypt, Courage in Canaan, Lonely Shur, and Sorrow in Sodom. His position is between the objectively psychological and the merely homiletic, and throughout he has an eye for the lessons for the present. A special feature is an appendix on 'the common doctrine of the fall', wherein he protests against the Pauline doctrine of inherited sin through the fall of Adam. It is a fair example of the strength and weakness of Mr Robertson's method, because the proposition that there is no *historical* link between the account of Adam and Eve and man's sin does not really touch the *psychological* fact of our consciousness of sin. Man's liability to sin provokes an explanation, which different peoples have framed differently. Convincing, also, has been the consciousness of a gulf between ordinary human nature and some better, purer state of existence—another psychical fact which has forced some theory. It is psychologically impossible to conceive how any doctrine of a Fall could arise and persist apart from certain typical experiences, and it is erroneous method to confuse facts of human nature, personal experience, &c., with the mythological, historical, and all other explanations, theories, and doctrines with which we may find them combined, whether in the Bible, in Christianity, or elsewhere. Especially significant is Mr Robertson's remark about the 'painful shortcomings in humanity', and the 'evolutionary plan of creation' which 'explains our aspirations and prayers for courage' (p. 281). But this is virtually to replace one doctrine or philosophy by another; and the fact that there is no keen consciousness of sin may not be so much a sign of evolution as sometimes seems to be assumed. What is really needed is a comprehensive and co-ordinated body of thought which shall seek to do justice to all the data, and not a comfortable and complacent theory of evolution which leaves behind all the uncomfortable and disturbing features. The psychological method of enquiry is still only at the beginning; it characteristically goes to the deepest and profoundest matters, but with no coherent conception of what the underlying realities may be. Hence it must be with very mixed feelings that readers will note this and every other psychological treatment of religion. One wonders, e. g., what Isaiah would have thought of the statement:

'fear of lightning was conceivably at the basis of the idea of danger in seeing God' (p. 126). What, then, must be the real relation between the experience of Isaiah (vi 5-7), St Paul (2 Cor. xii 4), and of any more modern testimony of a similar character, on the one side, and, on the other, the very intelligible fear of lightning on the part of our remote ancestors or of rudimentary people? Could anything more clearly shew that the psychological enquiry soon involves some theory of human nature, the universe, and the actual development of thought?

Another new work is the *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Macmillan, New York, 1917) by Professor Harlan Creelman, Ph.D., D.D., of Auburn Theological Seminary. Its novelty lies in its arrangement, for there are already well-known 'Introductions'. But while the customary method is to deal with the books according to their order in the English, or Hebrew Bible, Prof. Creelman discusses the literature from the point of view of history and chronology. Thus, the books, sections, or fragments, as the case may be, are taken up period by period, and handled from the point of view of both 'subjective' and 'objective' history, so as to cover both the history as related by the Old Testament itself and the history as amplified by the literature which (on literary-critical grounds) may be taken as illustrative of each period. As a familiar example one may refer to the history of the monarchy as related in the Book of Chronicles, and the light this particular description of the monarchy throws upon the thought of the age to which the 'chronicler' evidently belonged. Consequently the work is both analytic and synthetic, and serves the twofold purpose of providing a useful summary of the various sources of the literature that is of composite origin, and of enabling the reader to realize the tendency of biblical criticism to enrich the later period of biblical history at the expense of the historical trustworthiness of the earlier. It is a painstaking and thorough piece of work, and will be specially welcomed for its very complete list of bibliographical references and the chief critical work on the book or section under discussion. Its general position is that which may be associated with the names of Driver, G. A. Smith, Skinner, Moore, and others. It is a careful and useful compilation, but with a certain absence of independence and originality. Consequently it is hardly the book to put into the hands of those who have no sympathy with modern literary criticism; while those to whom this 'moderate' position appears hopelessly inadequate would find it difficult to justify many of the views that are taken. To the present writer it seems positively futile, for example, to talk about the approximate dates of J and E as ranging between 900 and 750 B.C., when the starting-point must be the recognition that, although editors abbreviated J E

and even excised portions, yet the post-exilic age has permitted the remainder to be preserved. Hence JE, as it stands, is not P; but it bears the *imprimatur* of the editors of the post-exilic age, and is evidence for that period (cf. *J. T. S.* xiii p. 89 sq.). Moreover, to some of us at all events, there is something quaint in the statement that the date of Deut. in the seventh century B.C. is one of the 'most absolutely assured results'. Space does not permit any further reference to other details, but when, as in all literary-critical problems, questions of religious and national historical development are inevitably involved, one is justified in believing that much more attention must be paid to these questions before the work of literary-historical criticism and the consequences for biblical theology can be said to be assured.

Hagios-Qados, by Anton Fridrichsen, is an interesting study on the Greek and Hebrew words for 'holy'—a reprint (in German) from the Proceedings of the University of Christiania (Dybwad, Christiania, 1916). His aim is to investigate the meanings and application of the term as a preliminary enquiry to its subsequent history in Christian thought. The uses of the Hebrew word are carefully tabulated, and in an interesting summary he briefly discusses the various theories of the origin of the conception. He agrees that it has 'grown out of' the common ground of primitive religion, and thus rejects Lagrange's view that 'holy' belongs to revealed religion, and 'unclean' is to be explained from the opposition to primitive elements of religion (pp. 28 sqq.). He then passes to the evidence supplied by the LXX, and to the significance of the choice of ἅγιος. The Greek word he derived from a root which in Sanskrit means to honour or bring a sacrifice to a deity (p. 42 sq.). The use of the word in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha is next handled, and a section is devoted to the meaning of the holiness of the Deity. He makes a very good point in recognizing by the side of a living, subjective feeling of what was 'holy' a rather conventional and merely edifying use of what was a traditional term; much in the same way that 'divine, divinely', and the like are loosely employed in English. This distinction between a consciousness of that which is transcendental and that of something that is merely exceptional seems to be of fundamental importance for the vicissitudes of religious beliefs; and, although the essay is not an easy one to follow, its chief merit seems to me to lie in its insistence upon the threads connecting the various nuances in literature and history and the bearing of the data upon the psychological treatment of 'holiness'.

The *Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society* for 1915-16, contains only one contribution of direct bearing upon the Old

Testament (viz. an ingenious explanation of the origin of the term Purim by Prof. Canney), but some of the special articles indirectly contribute. Dr Alphonse Mingana on 'The Transmission of the Qur'ān' is of interest for the early history of sacred literature and the speedy rise of legendary accounts of great reformers and other historical figures. 'Ships as Evidence of the Migrations of Early Culture', by Prof. G. Elliot Smith, apart from the intrinsic interest of the subject, is of methodological significance because of the question of the extent to which progress has been due to the influence of educated immigrants. What is important is that the mere presence of such immigrants does not necessarily imply their influence, and it is urged that the crucial factor is the use of the local population by the settlers who are exploiting some source of wealth and who can to this end control and subjugate the indigenes (p. 68 sq.). The argument is not wholly convincing, and it is difficult to understand the example on p. 72, where Pizarro's military domination of the Incas is taken as typical of what earlier adventurers may have done previously: the difficulty being that the earlier invasion is supposed to have introduced a new and progressive civilization, whereas the Spanish invasion can hardly be said to have had any exhilarating effect upon the civilization of the Incas. In fact the assumption that new knowledge has been introduced by men who compelled the local population to work for them (so again, p. 82) appears to me more like a theory of how some 'Kultur' *ought* to be imposed on other people—for their own good and for the greater glory of the exponents of that 'Kultur'!—than any hypothesis based upon facts. No one can deny that even those who work in 'gold mines or pearl beds' (p. 82) might learn *something* from the civilization of their employers, but those who are so revolutionary as to believe that civilization rests upon moral and spiritual factors will agree that Sir Elliot Smith has not proved his case. It may be noted incidentally that he ascribes to the Egyptians the conception of a ship as a living thing—as a dragon (p. 91 sq.); 'there can be no doubt that *this* quaint idea spread from one centre along the whole extent of the European and Asiatic littoral.' Is this why sailors call the ship 'she'?

George Dahl, Assistant Professor of Old Testament Literature at Yale University, has published a useful monograph: *The Materials for the History of Dor* (Connecticut Academy Transactions, May 1915, vol. xx, pp. 1-131). This little-known city enters into Palestinian history at several important periods, and Dahl's piece of research is very welcome. Together with the monographs on the history and geography of Gaza and of Sidon, by Meyer and Eiselen respectively (published by the University of Columbia), it prepares the way for

a new and wider grasp of the history of the land, and therefore for a new and firmer comprehension of the nature and significance of those religious vicissitudes which we are apt to mark off rigidly from one another, according as they 'belong' to the Old Testament or to the New Testament, and so forth. Among other suggestions may be noticed his explanation of the 'three heights' (? of Dor) in Joshua xvii 11 as due to a misunderstood gloss ('the third [town in the list] is Naphath'); this he supports by Ezek. xxi 14, where the obscure 'third time' apparently referred originally to the three occurrences of the word for 'sword'. As an indication of the varying fortunes of the city, Dahl points out that it is not mentioned at all by the classical Arab geographers (i. e. from the ninth to the twelfth century A. D.), it is passed over in lists and enumerations as though there were no town in the locality worth mentioning (p. 121); on the other hand, about the twelfth century B. C., Dor is prominent in the remarkable Egyptian record of the ambassador Wenamon; it maintains a fleet, and its king conducts himself with no little dignity and confidence before the representative of the Nile empire (pp. 34-38).

A translation of *Job*, in the Hebrew rhythm, by Colonel (retired) G. A. Noyes (Luzac, London, 1915), confines itself to the poetical portions (with the omission of the Elihu section). The effort is made to get a close metrical approximation and to present the same number of syllables in each line of the English as in the Hebrew. 'The translation may, in parts, be considered somewhat free, but, in view of the limits imposed by its nature, this seems to be unavoidable. In those cases where the Original admits of varied readings the writer has uniformly adopted the one which appeared to him to fit in best with the context and to maintain a connected sequence of ideas.' This quotation from the Preface is enough to indicate where readers are likely to differ from Colonel Noyes. For, while one may appreciate the diction of the translation, the Book of Job is often unfortunately much too difficult and obscure for one to rely upon a rendering without notes or comments to justify that which has been selected. The work is evidently the result of much care and thought, and the meaning of the Hebrew is frequently brought out clearly; thus the vague words ix 35 (RV 'for I am not so in myself') are paraphrased 'for in heart I am not as I seem'.

Mr R. R. Harwell's dissertation on the *Principal Versions of Baruch* (Yale University, 1915) is a painstaking and independent piece of work, worthy of closer attention than can here be given to it. It is a small monograph dealing with the relation between the different versions, and

the question whether they were at all directly influenced by any Hebrew text. He argues that the whole book (and not a part only) was written in Hebrew, and he upholds a pre-Christian date for the Greek translation. His treatment of the problem of composition and date, on pp. 63-66, is suggestive, but too brief to be convincing. Special attention is paid to the edition of Baruch by the late Dr O. C. Whitehouse (in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*), and in particular to his theory that the Syriac translator had before him the Hebrew original of the first three chapters of Baruch. Mr Harwell holds that the entire book is written in 'translation Greek'—but it may be said, without expressing any opinion upon the strength of his examples (pp. 52 sqq.), that the specimen of retranslation which he offers on pp. 57 sqq., is rather suggestive of 'translation Hebrew', e. g. the use of גְּלוּת for 'captivity' (and not 'exile'), and in the constr. st. (for גְּלוּת), and in iv 9 הַתְּרִיבִּין, an absolute example of the 'abomination of desolation'.

Fresh evidence of Spanish interest in Old Testament studies is to be seen in two fascicules of *Estudios de Crítica Textual y Literaria*, by A. Fernández Truyols, S.J. (Pontif. Ist. Bibl., Rome, 1917). They comprise (1) a brief introduction to the textual criticism of the Old Testament, and (2) text-critical notes on 1 Sam. 1-15. The two can be conveniently taken together; they give the reader a very adequate notion of the nature of textual criticism and its application to a portion of the Old Testament notorious for textual difficulties. Fr. Truyols provides a very useful introduction on the state of the Masoretic text and the way in which errors can be determined and corrected; little has escaped him, and he even takes note of the Nash papyrus in the University Library of Cambridge, upon which writers—less remote—sometimes fail to comment (p. 65). He devotes a very reasoned and searching examination to Naville's strange theory of the original language of the Old Testament (pp. 47-58), and does good service in recording the rules of textual criticism, as proposed by Houbigant, de Rossi, Driver, and others. There is also a useful examination of the employment of metrical theories (pp. 110-129). *À propos* of ancient scrupulosity (e. g. Baal changed to Bosheth), the author remarks that he has read a MS of the life of St Francisco de Borja where the copyist, in his detestation of 'liberalism', everywhere replaced the adjective *liberal* by some other synonym—*generoso, dadivoso, noble, &c.* (pp. 33 n. 3). He might have noticed the care taken in the early printed Hebrew Bibles to avoid printing the divine name *Elohim*. As a whole, the author's attitude errs on the conservative side, and one feels that a closer attention to the typical variations among parallel passages (to which he pays some attention) would have thrown more

light upon the nature of glosses, errors, and adjustments. For, often, it is not merely a case of textual corruption, but of subsequent adjustment; and here it is necessary to account, not for every variation, but only for the initial error or variation, which in turn will account for the rest. Further, it is true that the question may be, not which of two or more texts and versions is most perfect, but which is genuine (on 1 Sam. xiv 41, p. 87); but here at once deeper problems are involved, and the student has to make up his mind whether he is proposing to recover what (e.g.) Saul said, what the tradition or traditions relate that he said, and what more or less important conclusions can be drawn from the variations.

Two purely philological works may be briefly mentioned. (1) An entirely new edition of the familiar *Introductory Hebrew Grammar*, by the late A. B. Davidson, from the competent hands of Prof. J. E. McFadyen (J. Clark, Edinburgh, 1914), presents an old friend in a rather new and strange dress. Many alterations have been made—in order to reduce the horrors of Hebrew—a noteworthy feature being the addition, in the exercises, of sentences for pointing. A rather disconcerting feature is the unavoidably large number of corrections (p. xiii sq.)—due to the war (the work was set up in Leipzig)—and it will certainly be necessary at the earliest opportunity to issue a new edition in which they shall be incorporated. On this occasion note may then be taken of the following, which have been observed in passing: p. 93 l. 6 read פָּ; p. 120, בְּהִנֵּךְ in place of בְּהִנֵּךְ; p. 127 (no. 3), the remarks on הַיְיִיִּט are a retrogression from the earlier edition and the usual view; p. 162 (no. 9) read לְקַלֵּ. (2) Carl Gaenssle's pamphlet, *The Hebrew Particle אשר*, is a dissertation submitted to the University of Chicago (Cambridge University Press, London, 1915). It is a practically exhaustive discussion of the etymology and syntactical use of the relative particle in 142 pages, with complete index of the passages cited. He concludes that אֲשֶׁר and שׁ are not etymologically akin; and while the latter goes back to *ta*, one of the two demonstrative roots (§ 8, the other being *za*), the former was primarily a substantive denoting place. Of this primitive sense he finds many traces in the Old Testament, and he strongly supports his argument by pointing to the Assyrian use of *ašru* (*ašar*), and to analogies in other languages (§§ 33, 41 sqq.). There are some persistent misprints on pp. 37 sq., 70 (Arabic *dāl* for *dhāl*).

Om 'Den Gammeltestamentlige Theologi' som Theologisk Disciplin, by Johannes Jacobsen (Gad, Copenhagen, 1912), a little book on the history of Old Testament theology as one of the disciplines, is a broad

comprehensive sketch of its main features from the time of the Reformation to the present day. The author takes note of both 'conservative' and 'critical' tendencies, and of the extension of the subject through modern archaeological and other research. Perhaps the most illuminating example is the twofold treatment of Gen. xiv, as the chapter appears to Winckler and Völter respectively (pp. 72 sqq.). The rival 'pan-Babylonist' and 'pan-Egyptological' methods swallow each other up, but the author is content to specify and describe the various features in this field of enquiry rather than to take any constructive critical steps. The pamphlet is, in fact, an admirable bird's-eye view of the steps leading up to the present stage of Old Testament criticism, and illustrates at once its progressiveness and its incompleteness.

STANLEY A. COOK.